

1 THOMAS TOSDAL, STATE BAR NO. 067834
 2 ANGELA JAE, STATE BAR NO. 248571
 2 TOSDAL, SMITH, STEINER & WAX
 3 401 West A Street, Suite 320
 3 San Diego, CA 92101-7911
 4 Telephone: (619) 239-7200
 4 Fax: (619) 239-6048

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 6 DEENA DEARDURFF SCHMIDT

7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DEENA DEARDURFF SCHMIDT,) CASE NO. 07-CV-2343DMS (WMC)
 11)
 12 Plaintiff,)
 13 v.)
 14)
 15 BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE)
 16 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,)
 16 SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY,)
 16 JEFF SCHEMEL, DOES 1-15,)
 16 Defendants.)
 17)

**DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF'S
 COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF HER EX
 PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER
 COMPELLING DEFENDANTS TO
 PRODUCE UNREDACTED COPIES OF
 ALL DOCUMENTS CONTAINED IN
 INITIAL DISCLOSURES**

18 I, THOMAS TOSDAL, declare:

19 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of
 20 California and a partner of Tosdal, Smith, Steiner & Wax,
 21 attorneys of record for Plaintiff DEENA DEARDURFF SCHMIDT. As
 22 such I have personal knowledge of the facts referenced below.

23 2. Plaintiff applies to the Court *ex parte* for an order
 24 compelling Defendants BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA
 25 STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY, and JEFF
 26 SCHEMEL to produce unredacted copies of all documents
 27 produced with their Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule
 28 26(a) initial disclosures by April 16, 2008, before the early

1 neutral evaluation settlement conference scheduled to be held
2 on April 21, 2008.

3 3. Counsel for Defendants received notice of this *ex parte*
4 application on Friday, April 4, 2008, and has indicated that
5 he does not oppose this application.

6 4. This action was filed in the San Diego Superior Court and
7 removed by Defendants to District Court.

8 5. On February 25, 2008, both parties timely exchanged witnesses,
9 documents and other information pursuant to the FRCP 26(a)
10 initial disclosure requirements.

11 6. A review of Defendants' initial disclosures revealed that
12 certain documents produced, specifically emails and
13 correspondence from students and parents, contained
14 redactions. The substance of the communications was not
15 redacted but Defendants redacted the names of the persons who
16 authored them.

17 7. Counsel subsequently met and conferred with counsel for
18 Defendants by telephone requesting they produce un-redacted
19 copies of certain documents produced in Defendants' initial
20 disclosures.

21 8. By letter dated March 10, 2008, Defendants' counsel indicated
22 that they would provide "unredacted copies of those documents
23 as soon as the University has complied with its FERPA
24 obligations."

25 ////

26 ////

27 ////

28 ////

1 9. By letter dated March 25, 2008, counsel again requested they
2 produce "unredacted copies of all documents contained in the
3 initial disclosures in advance of the settlement conference"
4 and that if no agreement could be reached, the issue would be
5 raised with Magistrate Judge William McCurine.

6 10. The issue of the redacted copies of documents produced by
7 Defendants in their initial disclosures was raised with
8 Magistrate Judge McCurine during the April 4, 2008, conference
9 call.

10 11. Counsel for Defendants indicated that FERPA's confidentiality
11 requirements, a federal privacy law protecting the disclosure
12 of educational records, may apply to the documents which would
13 require either parental/student consent or a court order
14 before they produced the unredacted documents.

15 12. Counsel indicated that he would seek an order from the Court
16 *ex parte* compelling the disclosure of the unredacted documents
17 so that Plaintiff will be fully prepared for her participation
18 in the settlement conference scheduled to be held on April 21,
19 2008.

20 13. Counsel for Defendants indicated that he would not oppose the
21 *ex parte* application.

22 14. Counsel have met and conferred with Defendants' counsel and
23 unredacted copies of the documents cannot be produced in time
24 for the settlement conference unless a court order is issued
25 by this Court *ex parte*.

26 15. Plaintiff will be prejudiced if the *ex parte* motion is heard
27 according to the regular noticed motion procedures because
28 Plaintiff will not be able to properly prepare for and fully

1 participate in the early neutral evaluation settlement
2 conference scheduled for April 21, 2008, without the
3 unredacted documents.

4

5 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true
6 and correct. Executed on this 7th day of April 2008 at San Diego,
7 California.

8

S/Thomas Tosdal
Thomas Tosdal
ttosdal@tosdalsmith.com

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

TOSDAL, SMITH, STEINER
& WAX
401 West A Street, Suite 320
San Diego, CA 92101-7911
Telephone: (619) 239-7200
Facsimile: (619) 239-6048